II.   REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed March 7, 2005 (hereafter, "Office Action").

Claims 1-30 and 50-55 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. The Office Action rejected claims 1-30 and 50-55. The present Reply amends claim 50, leaving for the Examiner's consideration claims 1-30 and 50-55.

1. Amendments to Claims

Although no objections were raised to claim 50 on grounds of indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Applicant has amended claim 50 to refer in the preamble to "the system of claim 1" instead of "the of claim 1," thereby making the claim more fully consistent with the specification, and promoting greater definiteness.

2. Response to Rejections

As a preliminary matter, Applicant respectfully notes that the correct Attorney Docket Number is FXPL-01025US0 and not EXPL-01025US0 as indicated on the Office Action. Applicant respectfully requests that the appropriate correction be made.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-4, 20-24, 27 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tompkins et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,710,917; hereinafter, *Tompkins*). The Office Action rejected claims 5-8, 25, 28, and 51-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tompkins* in view of Baker, "Minspeak" ("Minspeak: A Semantic Compaction System that Makes Self-Expression Easier for Communicatively Disabled Individuals," *Byte*, 7, pp. 186-202; hereinafter, "Minspeak"). The Office Action rejected claims 9-19, 26, 29, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tompkins*. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The present invention discloses a personal computer for providing a conversation utterance to a remote listener. A user is thereby able to conduct a telephone conversation without speaking. The participant in the public situation is moved to a quiet mode of communication, e.g., keyboard, buttons, or touchscreen. The quiet user interface transforms the user's silent input selections into equivalent audible signals that may be directly transmitted to the other parties in the conversation.

Tompkins discloses a video conferencing network including remote video terminals interconnected to a switching network through coaxial cables (Abstract and col. 2, lines 53-63). *Tompkins* further discloses that a centralized controller is in data communication with each of the video terminals and the switching network and controls the configuration of the switching network to provide the appropriate audio and video paths in response to data received by the controller from the video terminals (Abstract and col. 2, line 63-col. 3, line 5). *Tompkins* makes no disclosure regarding accepting a phone call according to the Quiet Call communication system or a similar protocol, nor does *Tompkins* disclose using conversational representations in real time to respond to the call.

Contrary to the suggestion of the Office Action, nowhere does *Tompkins* disclose two critical limitations of independent claim 1: a memory for storing the conversation representation *and an associated conversation element, wherein the conversation element has an internal representation of an audible utterance*; and an audio output, coupled to the processor and memory, for *providing the audible utterance responsive to the control signal and the conversation element*. The only citation provided by the Office Action regarding these limitations is item 50 in figure 2, provided in reference to the limitation of a memory for storing the conversation representation and an associated conversation element, wherein the conversation element has an internal representation of an audible utterance. By contrast, item 50 in figure 2 is disclosed to be memory, but *Tompkins* makes no disclosures teaching how to use his memory for storing the conversation representation *and an associated conversation element, wherein the conversation element has an internal representation of an audible utterance*.

Contrary to the suggestion of the Office Action, nowhere does *Tompkins* disclose two critical limitations of independent claims 1: a memory for storing the conversation representation *and an associated conversation element, wherein the conversation element has an internal representation of an audible utterance*; and an audio output, coupled to the processor and memory, for *providing the audible utterance responsive to the control signal and the conversation element*. Similarly, contrary to the suggestion of the Office Action, nowhere does *Tompkins* disclose two critical limitations of independent claim 21: a memory for storing *a conversation element associated with the conversation representation, wherein the conversation element has an internal representation of an audible utterance*; and an audio output, coupled to the processor and memory, for *providing the audible*

utterance responsive to the control signal and the conversation element. The only citation provided by the Office Action regarding these limitations is item 50 in figure 2, provided in reference to the first of these limitations in claims 1 and 21 (in claim 1, a memory for storing the conversation representation and an associated conversation element, wherein the conversation element has an internal representation of an audible utterance, and in claim 21, a memory for storing a conversation element associated with the conversation representation, wherein the conversation element has an internal representation of an audible utterance). By contrast to these inventive limitations of the current claims, item 50 in figure 2 is disclosed to be memory, but *Tompkins* makes no disclosures teaching how to use his memory for storing the conversation representation *and an associated conversation element, wherein the conversation element has an internal representation of an audible utterance.* For these reasons, claims 1 and 21 are patentable.

Finally, contrary to the suggestion of the Office Action, nowhere does *Tompkins* disclose two critical limitations of independent claim 30: a memory for storing the *conversation representation icon and an associated conversation element, wherein the conversation element has an internal representation of an audible utterance*; and an audio generator, coupled to the processor, for generating the *audible utterance responsive to* the control signal and *the conversation element.* The only citations provided by the Office Action regarding these limitations are item 48 in figure 2, and col. 6-7, provided in reference to the limitation of an audio generator, coupled to the processor, for generating the audible utterance responsive to the control signal and the conversation element. By contrast, item 48 in figure 2 is disclosed to be a central processing unit (CPU), but *Tompkins* makes no disclosures teaching how to use his CPU as an audio generator, coupled to the processor, for generating the *audible utterance responsive to* the control signal and *the conversation element.* Similarly, col. 6-7 disclose details of a multifunction work station including multimedia terminal equipment, a local processor, a VCR auxiliary device, and an audio switch, but *Tompkins* makes no disclosures teaching how to use his multifunction work station as an audio generator, coupled to the processor, for generating the *audible utterance responsive to* the control signal and *the conversation element.* For these reasons, claim 30 is patentable.

The references cited in the Office Action, including *Tompkins*, and Minspeak, considered singly or in combination, fail to disclose all of the limitations of independent claims 1, 21, and 30. Claims 2-20, 22-29 and 50-55, as amended, each ultimately depend from one of the independent claims and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims and because of the additional limitations of these claims.

Accordingly, claims 1-30 and 50-55, as amended, are believed patentable over the cited references and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

III.   CONCLUSION

The references cited by the Examiner, but not relied upon, have been reviewed, but are not believed to render the claims unpatentable, either singly or in combination.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/6/05

By: J. Steven Svoboda
Reg. No. 44,366

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Fax: (415) 362-2928
Customer No.: 23910